

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

DAVID W. CRITES, 78188,)
Plaintiff,)
vs.)
WOOD RIVER POLICE DEPARTMENT,)
JOHN DOE 1,)
JOHN DOE 2,)
JOHN DOE 3,)
JOHN DOE 4,)
C. JOHNSON,)
J. THOMAS,)
J. HOEFERT,)
and B. ROMBACH,)
Defendants.)
Case No. 18-cv-00615-JPG

ORDER DISMISSING CASE

GILBERT, District Judge:

Plaintiff David Crites filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, for constitutional deprivations that resulted from an allegedly illegal search, seizure, and assault in Wood River, Illinois. (Doc. 1). The Complaint did not survive screening under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A and was dismissed without prejudice on April 18, 2018. (Doc. 6). Plaintiff was granted leave to file a First Amended Complaint on or before May 16, 2018. *Id.* However, he was warned that the action would be dismissed with prejudice and that the dismissal would count as a “strike” under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g), if he failed to file an amended complaint by the deadline. *Id.*

Plaintiff filed a timely First Amended Complaint, but it was also dismissed without prejudice at screening on September 6, 2018. (Docs. 9, 11). He was granted leave to file a Second Amended Complaint on or before October 4, 2018, if he wished to pursue his claims in this action. (Doc. 11, pp. 3-4).

Plaintiff missed the deadline. At least a week has passed since it expired. Plaintiff has not requested an extension or filed a Second Amended Complaint.

The Court will not allow this matter to linger indefinitely. Accordingly, this action shall be dismissed with prejudice for failure to comply with a Court Order (Doc. 11) and/or prosecute his claims. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b). The dismissal counts as one of Plaintiff's three allotted "strikes" within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(g).

Disposition

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice, based on Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court Order to file a Second Amended Complaint on or before October 4, 2018 (Doc. 11) and Plaintiff's failure to prosecute his claims. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b); *Ladien v. Astrachan*, 128 F.3d 1051 (7th Cir. 1997); *Johnson v. Kamminga*, 34 F.3d 466 (7th Cir. 1994). This dismissal counts as one of Plaintiff's three allotted "strikes" within the meaning of § 1915(g).

Plaintiff is further **ADVISED** that his obligation to pay the filing fee for this action was incurred at the time the action was filed. Therefore, the filing fee of \$350.00 remains due and payable. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1); *Lucien v. Jockisch*, 133 F.3d 464, 467 (7th Cir. 1998).

If Plaintiff wishes to appeal this Order, he must file a notice of appeal with this Court within thirty days of the entry of judgment. FED. R. APP. 4(a)(1)(A). If Plaintiff does choose to appeal, he will be liable for the \$505.00 appellate filing fee irrespective of the outcome of the appeal. *See* FED. R. APP. 3(e); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2); *Ammons v. Gerlinger*, 547 F.3d 724, 725-26 (7th Cir. 2008); *Sloan v. Lesza*, 181 F.3d 857, 858-59 (7th Cir. 1999); *Lucien*, 133 F.3d at 467. He must list each of the issues he intends to appeal in the notice of appeal and motion for leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 24(a)(1)(C). Moreover, if the appeal is

found to be nonmeritorious, Plaintiff may also incur another “strike.” A proper and timely motion filed pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) may toll the 30-day appeal deadline. FED. R. APP. P. 4(a)(4). A Rule 59(e) motion must be filed no more than twenty-eight (28) days after the entry of judgment, and this 28-day deadline cannot be extended.

The Clerk’s Office is **DIRECTED** to close this case and enter judgment accordingly.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 10/11/2018

s/J. Phil Gilbert
U.S. District Judge